NOT IN YOUR LIFETIME is there likely to be a Presidential campaign with so much drama and suspense as there promises to be in 1960. The most appreciated gift this year: HUMAN EVENTS. Two or more one-year subscriptions—one of which may be your own—$9 each. Two or more 6-month subscriptions, $5 each. Two or more 3-month subscriptions, $3 each. Mail your list today. We'll bill you in January. You can make out your entire Christmas list IN JUST 20 MINUTES!

HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 49 Wednesday, December 9, 1959 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

ROCKEFELLER: *The image of influence* (page 1)

COURT: *Douglas ready to run?* ..... (page 1)

BANG-JENSEN: *The jury is still out* ..... (page 2)

RAILROADS: *Featherbedding facts* ..... (page 3)

TVA: *Propaganda film planned* ..... (page 3)

Problem of Rockefeller: GOP pros continue to grit their teeth over the New York Governor's stubborn race for the Presidential nomination against the big lead which Nixon has accumulated within the party. Prominent among the concerns of the professional politicians is the claim that the mammoth Rockefeller fortune will push Nelson over the goal line at the 1960 convention. If that happens—reasons the clubhouse crowd—the Democrats will possess a formidable campaign argument.

In addition to the various newspaper stories along this line, which HUMAN EVENTS has noted in recent issues, a Hearst paper last week gave prominent space to still another such report. On December 1, the New York *Journal American* quoted the Dunn Survey, an organization with a good reputation for studying and reporting on election trends. The Dunn outfit offered an analysis entitled "The Rockefeller Purchase," in which it says that an image of Nelson Rockefeller is being created: "It has formed, will grow and if Mr. Rockefeller is nominated, will become so large as to be brutally certain to cause his defeat and discredit the Republican party beyond anything in the past."

The image, says the analysis, is one of a bright young man "relying on the vast economic influence of his family to buy the Republican nomination for President of the US."

Additionally, what the late Senator Robert A. Taft said about his own failure (the big news story last week) to win the GOP nomination in 1952 has made an indelible impression on the general public and the pros. Taft (in his post-nomination study of the reasons for his defeat, reproduced in HUMAN EVENTS last week) placed heavy responsibility for that 1952 convention defeat on "eastern financial interests" and their influence on others throughout the country. HUMAN EVENTS warned that Democrats would seek to exploit this developing image of Rockefeller.

Within 24 hours of the release of the posthumous Taft memorandum, two Democratic Senators promptly did just as predicted. Senator Stephen Young (D.-Ohio) told the press that "Taft's analysis of powerful forces that dominate and finance the election of Republican candidates for President simply corroborates convictions Democratic leaders have held for many years. Unquestionably these men who pull the financial strings at Republican national conventions and dictate the policies of that party have been those who over the years seek and receive special privileges." Senator Philip A. Hart (D.-Mich.) echoed Young's remarks.

Rockefeller's rebuttal last week to this developing trend of thought was to charge that it is not himself but Nixon who has obtained the "big money" support—a statement that no Republican politician can take seriously.

● What has gained more serious consideration in the Rockefeller camp's propaganda is the assertion that Nixon has obtained, by and large, the backing of the professional politicians, while Rockefeller has "the people." Popular support of Rockefeller is not indicated in numerous polls and straw votes, although Nixon's support among the pros is admittedly very strong.

However, in the key battleground of New Hampshire, where the first Nixon-Rockefeller test will come up next March 8, the Manchester (N.H.) *Union Leader* says that "it will be a battle of professionals and on both sides." That paper—the most important in the Granite State—in a detailed examination produces the names of a whole flock of "professional politicians" (state legislators, convention delegates, mayors, party functionaries, etc.) who have climbed on the Rockefeller bandwagon. The *Union Leader* concludes that this is not a picture of "pros" for Nixon and "amateurs" for Rocky.

Court Resignation: In the near future, the country may learn of the resignation of a Justice of the Supreme Court. Informed quarters in the Capital say that Associate Justice William Douglas plans to resign before long. (If so, having served 20 years, he would be eligible for a full salary pension of $35,000 a year.)

Since Douglas is 61 and in full vigor, presumably he will not remain idle. There are two views as to what he will do: (1) Some are convinced that he has his eye

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fixed on the inevitable clash of at least four candidates at the Democratic convention next July; it is a situation where a dark horse might carry off the crown. It is recalled that Douglas' name was a factor in the confused Democratic convention of 1948. (He was offered the second place on the ticket by Truman, but after some consideration finally decided that Truman could not win and turned down the offer of the Vice Presidential spot. But he did hanker for the No. 1 spot.) Ever since 1948 observers have regarded him as politically minded and his name has been mentioned a few times in connection with the nomination race in recent months.

(2) Another view—some believe that, after retiring, he would seek some role in international affairs. He has written books about the Middle East, Russia and Southeast Asia; and he has travelled widely and often in those regions in recent years. His approach in this field is (like his attitude on the bench) "liberal" and internationalist.

Mysterious Death: While New York police say the death of Povl Bang-Jensen was suicide, experts in the field of communism and subversion still raise doubts about this judgment and prefer to classify it as a "mystery." Bang-Jensen was a Danish diplomat who played a heroic anti-Communist role in connection with the Hungarian revolution aftermath; a United Nations functionary, he stubbornly refused to reveal the names of 80 Hungarian Freedom Fighter escapees. Bang-Jensen candidly said he could not trust the UN to keep the names confidential, because the Dane believed the organization was infiltrated with Communists. Bang-Jensen feared that these infiltrees would betray the names to the Kremlin and reprisal on their relatives in Hungary would follow. For his stand, he was dismissed from his job in the UN.

Bang-Jensen's body was found in a park in the Queens borough of New York City and the local police termed it suicide, on the basis of a suicide note found with the body. However, many suspicious circumstances appeared, including a gap of 72 hours between his disappearance and the finding of the body. No explanation of this has been offered by the police. His widow, in a statement last week, expressed doubt that it was suicide. One sentence in the so-called suicide note read, "I have been honest and wanted to do good, but I underestimated the forces I was up against."

Judge Robert Morris, long a congressional investigator of Red activities and familiar with much information about this case, said, "I just hope there will be a thorough investigation to insure that what may appear to be suicide may not actually have been foul play."

On Capitol Hill, most investigators place a question mark beside the verdict of suicide. These experts recall that, in a small hotel a few hundred yards from the dome of the Capitol, a famous "suicide" of a Soviet defector stirred Washington early in 1941—that of General Walter Krivitsky, who in 1937 had left his job as Soviet Intelligence Director for Western Europe and taken asylum in America. Krivitsky wrote a book describing the subversive warfare waged by the USSR in the West and he provided US and British authorities with vital security information. (One Krivitsky tip reportedly resulted in the execution by the British of a Soviet agent concealed within a confidential area of the British Government.) Because of such services, Krivitsky became a marked man and he feared for his life. Shortly before his death, say veterans in the State Department, he appealed to US authorities for protection. Some old timers in the US security field today feel that Krivitsky was shot by a Soviet agent and the real facts of his death were hushed up. Officially, the record still reads "suicide."

Nuclear Nonsense: A Soviet scientist early this month made a statement that gives aid and comfort to American critics of the US Government's civilian atomic reactor program—labeled "Nuclear Nonsense" by David Shea Teeple in an article published in HUMAN EVENTS on February 11, 1956.

Visiting Chicago on an exchange journey, Professor Vasily S. Emelyanov, director of Russia's peaceful atomic energy program, told the press (*Chicago Tribune*, November 8) that Russia still has "plenty of coal and oil" and for that reason is in no hurry to increase its production of electricity. He added that "we don't expect to increase our electrical capacity" by civilian atomic power. Yet, Soviet Russian production of conventional fuels falls far short of the US.

This fortifies arguments of American opponents of the civilian reactor "peacetime" program in general and the famous Shippingport (Pa.) reactor in particular. The latter was a very expensive enterprise and the electric current produced cost about eight times that of the ordinary coal-fueled electrical generating plants.

These critics go on and remind us that it is not merely the huge disparity in dollar cost of production that is a waste; the diversion of technical and scientific skills to such experimentation from the super-important mission of developing and producing weapons (such as the ICBM's) approaches a national scandal. On the latter depends our very existence as a nation. It is remarked that retiring Secretary of Defense McElroy last week did not present a very encouraging picture of our progress on missiles.

This lag—and it may grow, judging from implications of McElroy's statement—does not spring from mere expenditure of dollars and it has little to do with budgetary considerations; rather it springs from wasteful diversion of our scientists and technicians. If the latter were working on missiles and not on civilian reactors and various other civilian lines of production, the lag might well be closed. Despite the uproar after Sputnik in 1957, the Government has never sought to mobilize and concentrate scientific and technical skills in a "crash program" for production of weapons, as strongly called for by Senator Bridges in an article in HUMAN EVENTS on October 19, 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ike's Brother: Milton Eisenhower is widely blamed on Capitol Hill for the disastrous Latin American policy which led, among other things, to the Cuban Red regime. Nevertheless, he remains the strongest influence in the Administration on Latin American Affairs.

Last week, Representative Daniel J. Flood (D.-Pa.) pointed out that Panamanian papers reported Milton as favoring our handing over the canal to Panama, and that the State Department sent out a "cleverly worded" press release on the report without denying Milton called for us to surrender our treaty rights.

Flood said Milton's supposed statement "jolted all patriotic Americans," adding: "It is indeed significant that Dr. Eisenhower, whose advice on Latin American matters has been described in the press of Panama as of dubious value, has been appointed a member of the newly created President's National Advisory Committee on Inter-American Affairs."

Featherbedding: Just as in the steel dispute, current labor-management negotiations in the railroad industry are likely to break down on the issue of work rules. Three years ago, when the Nation's major railroads and the 21 unions representing railroad employees arrived at a three-year wage agreement, both sides also agreed to defer talks on work rules until after October 31, 1959. Now the companies are making an all-out effort to re-establish their right to manage by insisting upon the elimination of the unions' featherbedding practices that cost the companies $500 million a year, which they can ill afford.

The Association of American Railroads has released a number of examples of featherbedding in the railroad industry to make the public more aware of the need for the work rules changes it seeks to have adopted. Here are some of the latest examples of featherbedding:

● An eastern railroad recently shipped 11 cases of canned goods into St. Louis on a passenger train for use in its dining cars. The conductor and brakemen demanded and collected additional wages for performing "freight service," claiming that the goods were intended for sale by the railroad and therefore constituted freight shipments.

● When a passenger crew set out a baggage car for unloading at a midwestern station, not only did the brakeman get an extra day's pay for performing "yard work" but yard crewmen also received an additional day's pay because they were not called in to do the job.

● Freight engine crews going off duty at Pittsburgh are paid an extra day's wages if they are asked to turn their engine around before delivering it to another crew.

● In Texarkana, which is in both Texas and Arkansas, two switchmen are assigned to each yard crew in the Texas part of the rail terminal. But across town in Arkansas, where the same work is done, three switchmen are required in each crew because of that state's excess-crew law.

TVA: Twentieth Century Fox, which will soon exhibit a Soviet film lauding Socialist life in Russia, is now making a feature exalting socialism in the United States.

Under production is a film directed by Elia Kazan, who apparently has switched his interest from Tennessee Williams to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The picture, "Wild Fire," will show how the TVA miraculously brought wealth out of poverty and order from chaos in a depressed Tennessee.

According to the *New York Times,* approximately $400,000 will be spent by Hollywood in Tennessee during the production of the film—proof to Tennesseans of TVA's benefits!

● The *Chicago Tribune,* however, has another version of the TVA story and likens it to a Jesse James who robs the rich and rarely gives to the poor. (See "The Real Truth About TVA," by Congressman Ben Franklin Jensen in HUMAN EVENTS for August 5, 1959.) In a recent editorial, the *Tribune* made these points:

(1) TVA's subsidies are more than its declared "net income."

(2) Although TVA sales of power are increasing, so are losses of revenue, because TVA is making greater use of steam-generating plants which require high-priced coal.

(3) TVA originally went into the power business because of the low cost of water which produces cheap electricity. Even David Lilienthal, former chairman of TVA, once said: "It is extremely doubtful whether under the most favorable conditions electricity could be generated by coal at a low enough cost" to compete with hydroelectric power.

(4) TVA, once a threat to the coal industry, is now the biggest coal buyer in the country, but coal men are accusing it of dominating the market and wielding an "economic stranglehold" over producers.

So why, logically, asks the *Tribune,* has TVA "expanded to the point where it can no longer rely on its cheap water power, and why has it moved into the more expensive steam generating business at the expense of private industry, even though all this means losing more money?"

Erratum: Owing to a printer's error, Senator Roman Hruska, Republican of Nebraska, was incorrectly listed as a Democrat on Page 4 of last week's article, "Rating Your Members of Congress." HUMAN EVENTS regrets the error.

Bound Volumes of HUMAN EVENTS for 1959—indexed—may now be ordered for March delivery. Regularly $15. The special pre-publication price of $8.50 will be accepted until December 31. These handsome volumes make a valuable addition to your library. Volumes for 1955, 1956, 1957 and 1958 are available at the regular price of $15 each.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—— How to Settle the Steel Strike ——

By the American Economic Foundation
(51 E. 42nd St., New York 17, N. Y.)

THE INCORRECT ASSUMPTION that has confused collective bargaining in the steel strike is that wages should go up just as fast as production-per-man-hour goes up. This theory has been accepted in the United States by most industries ever since World War II. Obviously, as long as this theory prevails the consuming public will never again have the advantages of the lower prices that used to follow improved hourly productivity.

This error is based on the faulty conclusion that the human energy of the worker is responsible for the increased production.

As a matter of fact, less than 5% of the energy used up in steel production is supplied by the worker—the remaining 95% comes from the tools furnished him.

So, in steel, as in all manufacturing, credit for the production belongs to two groups of people: those who *supply* the tools and those who *use* them.

A "set of tools" for a steelworker, that is, the production facilities per employee, amounts to $20,000. In 1958 *the reward to the stockholder for supplying* this $20,000 set of tools was about $900, made up of about $600 in cash dividends plus the future benefit of about $300 of profit reinvested in the business.

Last year *the reward per employee for using* this $20,000 set of tools was $6,456, made up of $5,846 in cash plus $610 in future benefits.

THE HARD CORE of the argument is that the negotiators for the steelworkers want increases which would require that the companies take away part of the payment for supplying the tools and add it to the payment for using them.

The companies have offered increases providing that the union will agree to certain changes in work practices that would lower the production cost of steel. This the unions have not agreed to do.

Both sides claim to be firmly opposed to providing higher wages through higher selling prices. There you have the heart of the issue—the facts on which public opinion should be based.

No one in his right mind would suggest that the worker receive only the share of production that his energy accounted for. Such a policy would give the tool owners a fabulous reward, far out of line with the amount needed to stimulate saving and investment.

But no one in his right mind would suggest that the reward to the tool owners should be so small as to make them unwilling to continue to provide the tools *on which the progress and welfare of the tool users depend.*

In America, during times of peace, we have never had laws controlling wages and profits—we have always worked them out through free bargaining, which depends upon common sense and the spirit of fair play. In this longest of all steel strikes, bargaining has broken down.

There are only two forces that can break the deadlock, *Government action* which could sign the death warrant of free bargaining, and the *force of public opinion* which is the true supreme court in any free nation.

Another angle from which to view this matter is the overall distribution of the steel dollars received from the customer in 1958. Here it is:

Cost of Outside Goods and Services	42.3 cents
Cost of Human Energy (Payroll, Benefits, etc.)	38.2 cents
Taxes	7.8 cents
Cost of Tools Wearing Out	5.4 cents
Cost of Using Tools (Dividends and Reinvestments)	6.3 cents
Total	100.0 cents

If *you,* personally, were the final judge in this settlement, what would *you* do?

If *you* had $20,000 of your savings in steel stocks, would you think that your reward for supplying more than 95% of the productive energy was too much, too little, or about right?

If *you* were making a living using the $20,000 set of tools, would you think that your reward for supplying less than 5% of the productive energy was too much, too little, or about right?

It is high time that the general public, which is you, and you, and you, stopped being a disinterested, indifferent audience and started to make its opinion felt.

Whatever that opinion is, make it felt in your circle of influence whether that circle be great or small.

Talk about it, write about it, lay down your reasons for your judgment as to who should get how much for doing what in the steel industry.

If this strike is not settled with regard for the public interest, it can turn into an American tragedy because the pattern of this settlement will become the pattern for many other industries.

WILMER A. SWEETSER, Political Science Department, Spring Hill College (Alabama): "HUMAN EVENTS presents that side of the national and international news that is lacking in the average news coverage. My students and I try to cover every article for that keener insight into the news."

MARGARET AMES, Journalism Department, University of San Francisco (California): "HUMAN EVENTS is excellent. Refreshingly rightist, it is a perfect antidote to the leftist content of those newspapers traditionally studied in a journalism course."

J. ELIAS JONES, Director of Libraries, Drake University (Iowa): "HUMAN EVENTS is read regularly by a number of our students and faculty. Its conservative interpretation of current events is often regarded as a welcome corrective to the interpretations and viewpoints of other journals."

E. U. HARMON, President, Norwich University (Vermont): "Very stimulating and down to earth. I wish more people would try to learn the 'other side' of the picture."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.
Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year.
For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 49 HUMAN EVENTS December 9, 1959

Article Section

Confessions of a Bureaucrat

Part II: Nuclear Division

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

By POTOMACUS

WHEN I WAS A BUREAUCRAT I could have become a Scientist for $5. It was right after the War, and I was stationed at one of the atom places—a civilian on the Army payroll, checking on "personnel ceilings." We would go to a supervisor who wanted to hire somebody and ask if he really needed a new man. Most supervisors would look you right in the eye and say, "Yes." So what could you do? But every now and then a supervisor would chicken out, and you could claim a saving. I was an "Administrative Analyst." But later they changed that title. I guess somebody noticed the initials.

Before the War I had been a composition teacher and had got pretty sick of grading themes. But that kind of experience is invaluable to a bureaucrat. I have seldom seen a draft memorandum that I did not honestly feel should be rewritten. It was partly my literary background that put me in a position to become a Scientist. In late 1945 and early 1946 the atom places were all broken out with organizations of Scientists—"men who made the atom bomb." Most of us stationed at the atom places never knew, because of Security, who made the bomb. It was very surprising to discover, in some cases, who did; for they were guys we had been reasonably sure were doing nothing. It shows you how good the Security was.

Actually, it is a miracle how the bomb got made. I remember one building where out of 1,500 employees they said there was one guy who knew what was supposed to be going on, and throughout the War he never once lost the utterly hopeless expression on his face. He was a real Scientist, I think. What made him so unhappy was being assigned to a production building. Production people are so stupid. Almost as stupid as Congressmen—to a Scientist.

The organizations of Scientists were supposed to do something about everybody else's being so stupid. These organizations of Scientists were *not* concerned with science, for science was already in the hands of Scientists and they were not stupid, so it was unnecessary to do anything further about science. Production and politics, however, were as yet in the hands of stupid people who were not Scientists, and it was therefore necessary for the Scientists to organize, to tell the non-Scientists to quit being so stupid. This was practically equivalent to telling them to drop dead, but if you are a Scientist you must learn to face Facts, and the first Fact in any given situation is that people who are not Scientists are Stupid.

It is as the young Scientist said to Theodore H. White at Brookhaven, when they were talking about the House Committee on Un-American Activities and Dr. E. U. Condon. "My God," he said, "no matter what the score on Condon could be, you just can't have a bunch of dumb jerks like members of that committee passing on the credentials of scientists."

STUPID PEOPLE are always trying to pass on the credentials of Scientists. You can't do it. For instance, they talk about how much Scientists should be paid. Scientists should not be paid anything. They should have all the money. Then they can pay all the stupid people what *they* deserve, and it is mighty little I can tell you.

One or two of the Scientists at the atom place where I was after the War seemed to think that maybe I could do a snow job for them. Maybe I could write. Not be a "science writer." Scientists do not think too much of science writers. A science writer tries to help stupid people understand science, which is impossible and probably undesirable. It was a different role the talent scout had in mind when he tentatively eyed me—a sort of low-grade Lippmann. A philosopher.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A philosopher means you get stupid people to do what Scientists want. There are not many Scientists who can do that, because they can't stand to talk to such stupid people. A philosopher does not much care. It's a living. If you missed the turn on being a Scientist yourself, what can you expect? It is like being an NCO or butler.

I had expedited some pay raises for Scientists. There were a couple of places where you could handcarry a status change form and save a day or two over the inter-office mail. It could mean the difference of a two weeks pay period. You do that once or twice for a Scientist and you are a philosopher.

"Why don't you join the Association of Scientists?" the President of one of the units asked me.

"I am not a scientist," I said.

"Makes no difference," he said. "Maybe you can write."

"I read your press releases," I said. "I disagree."

This made a difference. "Tell you what," he said. "Come to some meetings. We can talk."

I went. They talked. I walked.

For $5 I could have been a Scientist—an atomic Scientist. The dues were cheap. But this is what they were going to say, and if you joined you said it with them—this is what they were going to say about the atomic bomb:

(1) There is no secret. (I knew there were a thousand secrets.)

(2) There is no defense. (I knew there was—then, anyhow—preemption.)

(3) International control — maybe "World Government," maybe not called that—is necessary. (I knew this meant liquidating the United States.)

IT WAS HARD TO BELIEVE that they were all going to say that, and that that was all they were going to say—though they would find a hundred ways to say it. So I would have stayed and argued, no telling how long, because I like to argue, but I got a shock.

They met in a business office after hours, and just before the meeting was to be called to order a young Scientist was typing out a press release. He was feeling pretty good, I guess—sitting there typing and a crowd of 12 or 15 milling around getting settled for the meeting—and he called out, "What if General Groves comes out with something like this before we get to the papers?"

He didn't sound as if he expected an answer, but he got one. There was what you might call a field-grade Scientist there. He had been around, and he didn't think anything was funny. He told the kid Scientist: "In that case we will tear this up and say the opposite. *We will always say the opposite of what General Groves says, no matter what it is.*"

That was early in 1946—probably February. I have never forgotten it. It is so Scientific.

A YEAR LATER, David Lilienthal—a philosopher—was talking to the Senate Section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, trying to get confirmed as first chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, which had been set up by a law—the McMahon Bill—lobbied through by the organized Scientists, who now demanded the confirmation of Lilienthal and Senator Kenneth McKellar's head on a charger. Stupid people thought that Lilienthal was soft on Security because the Scientists who were demanding his confirmation had spent the preceding year saying Security is stupid because "there is no secret." The stupid people (who were suspicious of Lilienthal) admired General Groves because he believed in military secrecy and Security, which was stupid of him.

Obviously, however, people who are stupid enough to believe in Security and admire General Groves in the first place could be persuaded by a philosopher to accept Lilienthal if he would denounce General Groves *for violating Security!* So he did. As follows.

There is a book called the Smyth Report. It was the original official release of scientific information about the War-time work on the atomic bomb. It was written by Scientist Henry D. Smyth and authorized for publication by General Groves. What could Groves do? We are just lucky Henry Wallace was not President in the summer of 1945. He *was* Secretary of Commerce,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

replacing Jesse Jones. (We sure have our ups and downs on that job, don't we?) I'm just giving you an illustration of the times. The pressure on Groves to bubble over with everything was tremendous. Of course there was pressure too to be sensible. In the upshot, the Smyth Report told a lot, and there was a lot it did not tell. Considering everything, Groves seems to have been a veritable Solomon in his judgment of what to release and what to withhold.

Naturally, the Scientists complained that it did not tell more. "We were very caustically criticized," said Senator Hickenlooper, speaking of Government officials, "because there was not more publicity and more detail and more disclosure of secrets than was contained in the Smyth report."

ALL THAT CRITICISM—which was in effect a condemnation of Groves *for not having released more information*—came from supporters of Lilienthal, who usually seemed to know pretty well *why* they were supporting him. But when it served an important temporary political purpose (getting himself confirmed), Lilienthal did not hesitate to reverse his field and condemn Groves *for having released too much information.* In other words, Lilienthal was apparently at one with those who decided to say the opposite of what General Groves said, no matter what it was. "The Smyth report," Lilienthal told the Senators in 1947, "is the principal breach of security since the beginning of the atomic project . . . it is hard for me to be temperate in my feeling . . . . I know it was recommended for release by committee; and authorized by General Groves . . . . I am sorry to be so candid about it, but this thing has been seething in me for quite a while."

At the same hearings appeared Bernard Baruch, who was asked what he thought of the criticism of the Smyth Report. Here is a portion of his interesting testimony:

> Senator *McMahon* . . . . The Smyth report was given out by the Army, was it not?
>
> Mr. *Baruch.* But I want to tell you before they did that the scientists certainly tore into them.
>
> As for General Groves, for whom I have the highest respect, I never thought he got his just deserts: I think justice has never been adequately given to this man, who has undertaken on the industrial side of war the most unparalleled, unprecedented, and seemingly impossible job of making the atomic bomb. He had to fight industrialists, scientists, and everybody else. They made that poor fellow's life miserable . . . .
>
> While the military gave it up, the others certainly lambasted them before they got anything out of them.
>
> Senator *Johnson* (Edwin C. Johnson, Democrat of Colorado). You think, then, that the Smyth report came out from the military under tremendous pressure?
>
> Mr. *Baruch.* Oh, yes, sir. I think they will all tell you that.

THE EVIDENT HYPOCRISY of philosopher Lilienthal in his 1947 condemnation of the Smyth report was virtually admitted two years later when, in February 1949, he told the Joint Committee, speaking of the issuance of the Smyth Report: "I myself think that was right." By 1949 Mr. Lilienthal was as confirmed as he was ever going to be, and was apparently all seethed out on the subject of General Groves' "breach of security." Besides, the General was by then so effectively blocked out of the atom business that nobody any longer thought it was necessary to say the opposite of what he had said, no matter what it was. It was the year of the first announcement of an atomic explosion in Soviet Russia.

These are some memories of an old bureaucrat who could have been a Scientist—at least for statistical purposes. In personal appearances I would probably have been billed as a philosopher. I don't know. I never got that far. I wouldn't go along. You don't hear too much about either Lilienthal or General Groves these days.

But of course Scientific attitudes and the principles of philosophy never change. Scientists always demand, and philosophers always give in. We have even had philosophers in the Pentagon. As for the Senate, half of them are philosophers. They knew that their stupid constituents wanted them to vote to confirm Admiral Strauss as Secretary of Commerce, because he promoted the H bomb, demoted Oppenheimer, and believed in the stupid system of Security. They also knew that Scientists

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were opposed to the Admiral—for the identical reasons their stupid constituents admired him! What can you expect a bunch of philosophers to do in such a case? Drink hemlock, like Socrates; or like Empedocles leap into the volcano? Why drag the United States with them? It is what the Scientists want.

The outstanding philosopher last season was Senator Clinton Anderson, Democrat of New Mexico. He said the opposite of what Admiral Strauss said, no matter what it was.

Admiral Strauss is worse than "stupid"—he is "unethical." Stupid people do not want what Scientists want until a philosopher explains it to them, but "unethical" people will not do what Scientists want *all the time,* even when it is explained to them. The only way to deal with an "unethical" person is to slug him.

"I intend," said philosopher Anderson to his colleagues of the Senate, "to raise certain questions about the views and methods of operation of this nominee . . . . Has he been obsessed with secrecy . . . ?"

Are you, Senator, kidding? It is as the Scientist said (Dr. David L. Hill, who though a Scientist, is so extraordinarily "ethical" that he will, to get a job done, talk directly to stupid people himself): "I feel that Admiral Strauss has been so narrow and fearful in his interpretation of where security lies that he has overridden and largely lost in his own administration the positive benefits which may grow out of scientific exchange."

The Admiral, says the Scientist, has an "excessive and apparently irrational dedication to secrecy. He never seems to have been able to understand that scientific or technical secrets are as evanescent as the morning dew on a summer day." (That sounds as if the Scientist thought the Admiral was stupid, but he does not, for he knows—indeed this testimony is largely concerned with this—that the Admiral is actually "unethical.")

Once, though, Strauss was involved in an exchange of information. *And that was bad too!* It was, in fact, a violation of secrecy and Security!

"In 1956," charged Senator Anderson, "Mr. Strauss also held out [from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy] important information on another matter—namely, AEC plans to transfer secret blueprints of the Nautilus *submarine to the British even though there were still doubts as to British security procedures in the wake of the Klaus Fuchs case." You may think that sounds like "McCarthyism"—criticizing Britain for not having tight security—but you probably don't realize that this is being said by a philosopher against an "unethical" person (an isolationist) on behalf of Scientists. In fact, you are probably pretty stupid yourself.*

"Here was the AEC Commissioner," said Anderson, "who previously had objected on security grounds to sending unclassified miniscule quantities of radioisotopes to Norway, now engaged in ramming through arrangements to transfer the secret of the *Nautilus* reactor to a country where security questions still existed."

Strauss had thought we should not ship isotopes to Norway in 1949, and he thought we should give *Nautilus* information to Britain in 1956. In other words, sometimes you share a secret, sometimes you don't. Even a stupid person can understand that.

But only a Scientist can really understand, and only a philosopher can unabashedly declare, that it is Bad to share those non-existent secrets which it is so Very Bad to try to keep.

The first part of "Confessions of a Bureaucrat" was published by HUMAN EVENTS on January 29, 1958. Reprints are still available at the prices listed in the coupon box below.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "CONFESSIONS OF A BUREAUCRAT" (Part 1 or Part II) at $_____

[] Payment enclosed [] Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20c (coins not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles, add 1c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.

Enter my subscription [] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED